

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as presently amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 and 11-14 are pending in this application. Claims 1-8 and 11-14 stand rejected.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-8 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by **Jung** (USP 6,507,377). For the reasons set forth in detail below, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As will be discussed in detail below, it is respectfully submitted that **Yung** does not disclose or suggest the claimed “bezel” having an “extension portion of the bezel”, as recited in independent claims 1, 5 and 11.

Yung discloses a liquid crystal display mounting assembly. As shown in Figs. 1-3, the mounting assembly includes a metal frame 8 that receives a liquid crystal cell 2, a back light 4 and a circuit board 6. The metal frame 8 is provided with concave step portions 10 at opposite sides of its top end. The metal frame 8 receiving the liquid crystal cell 2, the back light 4 and the circuit board 6 are mounted within a synthetic resin mould 12. The mould 12 includes a plurality of U-shaped suspensions 14 having a hook 16 formed at the free end of the suspensions 14. The hook 16 is fixedly hooked on a corresponding concave step portion 10 of the metal frame 8 when the metal frame 8 is mounted within the mould 12.

The Examiner’s interpretation of the **Yung** reference is discussed on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action. Specifically, the Examiner considers (1) the claimed “plate” to be shown in Fig. 1

as an unlabeled element surrounded by the frame 8; (2) the “chassis” to correspond to element 14 (U-shaped suspensions); (3) the claimed “bezel” to correspond to the metal frame 8; (3) the claimed “extension portion of the bezel” to correspond to a portion near element 16; (4) the claimed “cover enclosing a back side surface of the display unit” to correspond to the mould 12; and (5) Fig. 3 illustrates the display device having a height that is equivalent to a total height of the display unit and the cover only.

The Examiner considers the metal frame 8 to correspond to the claimed “bezel” and the “extension portion of the bezel” to correspond to a portion near element 16. However, **Yung** does not disclose or suggest the claimed “bezel being provided with an extension portion that extends from a side of the display unit and outwardly projects beyond an end of the chassis at a level of an upper surface of the cover”. As noted above, the Examiner considers the U-shaped suspensions 14 to correspond to the claimed chassis and the metal frame 8 to correspond to the claimed bezel. It is clear that the metal frame 8 does not “extends from a side of the display unit and outwardly projects *beyond an end of the chassis at a level of an upper surface of the cover*”.

More specifically, the portions of the metal frame 8 near element 16 (considered by the Examiner to be the “extension portion of the bezel”) are the concave step portions 10 with which the hooks 16 engage (see col. 2, line 57-58). However, if the U-shaped suspensions 14 are considered to correspond to the chassis (as the Examiner asserts), then the concave step portions 10 do not outwardly project beyond an end of the chassis *at a level of the upper surface of the cover*. As seen in Fig. 3 of **Yung**, at the level of the upper surface of the mould 12 (i.e., cover),

the concave step portions 10 (i.e., extension portion of bezel) clearly do not outwardly project beyond an end of the U-shaped suspensions 14 (i.e., chassis).

Accordingly, it is submitted that **Yung** does not disclose or suggest the bezel having a bezel extension portion as recited in independent claims 1, 5 and 11. Further, dependent claims 2-4, 6-8 and 12-14 patentably distinguish over **Yung** for the same reasons as the dependent claims by virtue of their dependency thereon. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under §102 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and accompanying remarks, it is submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection and an indication of allowability of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that there are issues remaining to be resolved in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite and complete prosecution of this case.


Application No. 10/772,251
Art Unit: 2871

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
Attorney Docket No.: 042081

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "William M. Schertler". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "William" and last name "Schertler" being clearly legible.

William M. Schertler
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 35,348
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

WMS/dlt